

DRAFT NOTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 19, 1999

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Steve Hogan, Scottsdale, Acting Chairman  
\*Victor Mendez, ADOT  
Debbie Kohn for William Bates, Avondale  
Patrice Kraus, Chandler  
\*Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills  
Tami Ryall, Gilbert  
\*Ken Martin, Glendale  
Doug Sanders, Goodyear  
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park

Chris Plumb for Tom Buick, Maricopa County  
Jeff Martin, Mesa  
\*David Moody, Peoria  
\*Tom Callow, Phoenix  
\*Dick Schaner, Queen Creek  
Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs, RPTA  
\*Bill Parrish, Surprise  
Harvey Friedson, Tempe

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Patrick  
McDermott, Chandler  
\*Street Committee: Ron Krosting, Mesa  
Pedestrian Working Group: Maureen Mageau-  
DeCindis for Mike Branham, Surprise

\*Intermodal Management System Working  
Group: Dave Berry, Swift Transportation  
Company  
Telecommunication Working Group: Debbie  
Kohn, Avondale

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dawn Coomer, MAG  
John Farry, MAG

Terry Johnson, MAG  
Paul Ward, MAG

1. Call to Order

The meeting began at 10:10 a.m. without a quorum present.

2. Funding Policy Guidelines for Programming Regional Transportation Funds

On January 5, 1998, the TRC gave additional consideration to funding guidelines related to Policy Guidelines adopted by the Regional Council for programming Regional Transportation funds.

Concern was expressed that additional time was needed to adequately address the funding guidelines. There was a consensus to further address guidelines at a special meeting of the TRC.

The meeting began with an overview by Terry Johnson. Steve Hogan asked if the issue of adding an additional phrase to the guidelines as raised by Patrice Kraus at the last meeting had been addressed. Tami Ryall recalled that Patrice was to discuss this issue further with Eric Anderson. Terry added that perhaps the intent of the paragraph could be clarified further.

Steve suggested the discussion begin with item one and the possibility of a funding allocation for transit. Jeff Martin mentioned that staff needed to provide information on the benefits or problems with providing \$10 million annually for transit. Chris Plumb asked how much was given presently, and Paul Ward responded that approximately \$3-\$4 million is provided currently. Paul noted that defining transit may be problematic. The committee discussed this, with Paul explaining that the construction of the freeway system might be limited with an allocation to transit. Tami added that some freeway projects can be done with CMAQ funds. The committee discussed this issue further, and Jeff noted that a minimum allocation of some sort is needed for transit.

Bryan Jungwirth noted that there was a question of providing transit allocations with TEA-21, and the committee discussed this idea. Steve summarized the issues. First, how should transit be defined? The second issue is to provide a commitment to transit with an allocation. Debbie Kohn suggested using a percentage of funds rather than an absolute amount. Bryan suggested a division among all modes, and asked how much was available. Paul responded that nearly \$100 million was available for a six-year period. Bryan noted that \$10 million annually for transit seemed appropriate. Paul continued by noting that approximately \$15 million annually is an increase over ISTEA, which is above the \$33.6 million given to freeways. Maureen Mageau-DeCindis asked about modal allocations to pedestrians and bicycling. Jeff responded that not all modes would receive allocations. Debbie asked how much would be left for other modes after the allocation to transit and freeways.

John Farry noted that more information may be needed before making a decision. Eric's life cycle program data was an essential missing piece. Terry added that ISTEA discouraged community and modal allocations. Steve asked why this topic was being discussed if the information was not yet available. Jeff agreed, and Debbie asked if last year's guidance could be used in this area. Patrice reminded the committee that the goal of developing guidelines was to determine what types of projects should be funded. Jeff added that the process used to allocate funds should also be addressed. Tami Ryall suggested documenting existing and short-term need for the various modes. Debbie added that smaller cities need transit, and Bryan responded that smaller cities need to provide funding for operations of transit. Patrice suggested discussing this issue at a later time when more information was available, and the committee agreed.

The committee then discussed the issues of project size and local match rates. Patrice noted that the intent is to not harm smaller communities and to reward local commitment to project completion. Jeff suggested exempting cities smaller than 50,000 from the match requirement. Patrice suggested that match rates could be decreased with additional obligation authority available during the close-out process. Chris Plumb noted that a higher share of federal funds was needed to design the project to

federal standards. Tami suggested using a sliding scale. Steve explained that the original intent was to make providing a higher match optional. Making the higher match a requirement changed the impact of this decision.

Debbie noted that the higher match may be difficult in times of economic downturn. Patrice noted that this change would not likely impact smaller cities, but larger cities. Chris asked for discussion on how projects are selected, and the committee discussed this.

Tami asked about the applicability of match rates to cities less than 50,000. Steve noted that match rates would apply to everyone based on project size. Patrice mentioned that a type of waiver for the higher match could be given for smaller communities, but the match should vary with project size.

Tami noted that only large projects costing over \$1 million would require the higher match. Steve and Tami agreed that a sliding scale would be appropriate. Patrice voiced the need to work with smaller communities to show them the benefit of this policy in increased funding available for other smaller projects. Steve noted that this policy would be a requirement rather than optional. Patrice added that project phasing would have to be addressed in the policy as well.

Paul Ward distributed a list of projects submitted to show the costs of various projects. Steve asked the committee if a sliding scale approach was logical, and noted that smaller communities needed to understand the decision. Patrice mentioned the policy could include a hardship clause to accommodate smaller communities. Steve summarized that project size should not be limited, but that the match should change depending on project size. The increased match would be a requirement for all projects rather than giving projects higher ranking in the evaluation and selection process. Jeff added that hardship situations could have different requirements.

Steve noted that only cost effectiveness discussion remained. Debbie suggested postponing the discussion. Patrice asked if this was an effort to rank across modes. Steve suggested removing the item for now. Patrice noted that pedestrians, bicycles and transit needed to not be placed in a poor position because of this criteria. Debbie added that cost effectiveness for videoconferencing would also be difficult to show because of the long-term impact. Steve suggested addressing these concerns at a later time. He added that the transit allocation issue would also have to be addressed.

The meeting ended at 11:16 a.m.